DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 932 08 VT 007 376

By-Samson, Harland E.

Regional Workshops in Project Development for Distributive Education Curricula. Final Report.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-7-0467
Pub Date Dec 67
Grant-OEG-3-7-070467-3084
Note-44p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30
Descriptors-*Curriculum Development, *Distributive Education, *Program Development, *Program Evaluation, *Project Training Methods, Student Projects, *Teacher Workshops

Two regional workshops were held to expedite development and improvement in the scope and quality of project training in distributive education. The activities center around the development of instructional projects for high school level distributive education students. Each workshop consisted of about 42 hours of formal instruction, 30 hours of preparation and reporting, plus pre- and post workshop organizing of project materials. A total of 52 experienced distributive education coordinators participated in developing 22 group projects and 52 individual projects which can be found in "Workshop Report: Distributive Education Project Development Workshop at Rutgers" (VT 007 375) and "Workshop Report: Distributive Education Project Development Workshop at the University of Wisconsin" (VT 007 377). This report contains a summary of the development and conduct of the project development workshops and the evaluation of each workshop and subsequent dissemination success. A total of 19 recommendations are made by the project review committee relative to project development workshops. (MM)

BR 7-0467
PA-08 CI

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 7-0467

Grant No. OEG-3-7-070467-3084

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CURRICULA

December, 1967

ED023932

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VT007376

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report

Project No. 7-0467

Grant No. OEG-3-7-070467-3084

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CURRICULA

Final Report

2

Harland E. Samson

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

December, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page		i
Table of Contents		ii
Summary		1
Section I	- Introduction	3
Section II	- Findings and Results	6
Section III	- Recommendations	9
Appendix A	- Application Form	11
Appendix B	- Summary of Participant Reactions and Suggestions for Rutgers Workshop	19
Appendix C	- Summary of Participants Reactions and Suggestions for University of Wisconsin Workshop	23
Appendix D	- Summary of Responses on Supervisor Questionnaires	27
Appendix E	- Summary of Responses on Participant Questionnaires	35
Eric Resume'	- Rutger's Workshop Report	42
Eric Resume'	- University of Wisconsin's Workshop Report	43
Eric Resume'	- Final Report	44

SUMMARY

Distributive Education Project Development Workshops

Distributive Education Project Development Workshops were conducted at Rutgers - The State University from June 19 to June 30, 1967 and at the University of Wisconsin from July 30, to August 11, 1967, pursuant to Contract Number OEG 3-7-070467 with Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research, U. S. Office of Education.

The central purpose of these two regional workshops was to expedite development and improvement in the scope and quality of project training in distributive education. The workshop programs provided instruction in both professional distributive education and in technical business content. The activities of the workshop centered around the development of instructional projects primarily for high school level distributive education students. These projects were designed for group or individual useage. Each workshop consisted of about 42 hours of formal instruction, 30 hours of preparation and reporting, plus pre and post workshop reading and organizing project materials.

The participants were experienced distributive education teacher coordinators who met selection criteria including the potential to disseminate the workshop information to distributive personnel in their state. A total of 52 participants attended the workshops (25 at Rutgers, 27 at University of Wisconsin). Each workshop produced a workshop report which contain , in total, 22 group projects and 52 individual projects, plus all original papers and presentations given at the workshops.

Each participant developed a dissemination plan for sharing the workshop material with his fellow teachers. Most plans depended heavily on mailing copies of projects and papers to all D.E. teachers in their state. Also frequently planned was a personal presentation by the participant at a state coordinators conference or similar gathering of distributive personnel.

Participants evaluated the workshop they attended. Most highly rated aspects were those topics dealing specifically with projects and project training. A follow-up of dissemination effort was made in mid-October, 1967 (about 8 weeks after the last workshop). A questionnaire was sent to each participant and respective State Supervisor of D. E. By that date 63% of all participants had made at least one major presentation to the D. E. teachers in their state reaching an estimated 1560 teachers with some information on project training. As the 1967-68 school year progressed more participants reported accomplishment of planned dissemination activities.

Recommendations relative to project development workshops include:

1. State level leadership needs to be adequately informed of current thinking and philosophy on projects and project training.

2. State supervisor and participant need to work out in advance of workshop plans for disseminating results to teachers.

3. Regional workshops should be undertaken to further develop projects and project training concepts.

4. Funds for reproduction of workshop materials need to be made at either state or national level so that all D. E. teachers may have copies of workshop materials.

5. Additional projects, guidelines to project training, aids and similar materials need to be developed and disseminated, preferebly, through the office of the state supervisor to all D. E. teachers.

Copies of Workshop Reports, both Rutgers and University of Wisconsin, were sent to each participant, to each State Supervisor of Distributive Education, and to each Head Teacher Educator for Distributive Education.

SECTION I

Introduction

The Vocational Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210, Section 10, Item D) removed restrictions limiting reimbursed distributive education to those gainfully employed in distributive occupations. To assure vocational application of classroom learning for students not receiving cooperative occupational experience an alternative method called "project laboratory or project method" was designated. This project laboratory plan was defined as "the organizational pattern for preparatory instruction, which involves a regularly scheduled series of individually designed learning activities that give students an opportunity to apply theory in practice, while developing competencies through projects related to their distributive occupational objectives."

Background of the workshops

The opportunity for distributive education to use project laboratory plans enables the states and schools to expand and supplement distributive education to serve more youth. Because distributive education has historically used only the cooperative plan, teaching personnel are not prepared to move rapidly into the use of projects and participating activities. Further, few materials are available in project type instruction. For these reasons there was an urgency for national workshops which would prepare selected distributive education personnel from each state in the development and implementation of project programs.

A few states and schools had seriously pursued the development of D.E. project programs during the 1965-1966 and 1966-67 school years. However, on a national basis, the expansion of distributive education via the project plan had not been as rapid or as effective as desired. The delay in moving to such plans did not necessarily indicate unwillingness to go to a new pattern of instruction but, rather, indicated unsureness as to how it might best be done.

Regional workshops, undertaken with common planning, common objectives, and to some degree shared consultative assistance, can provide a concerted effort to extend to all states assistance in planning project curricula and developing project activities for distributive education.

The central purpose of these workshops was to expedite development and improvement in the scope and quality of the project approach to distributive education. It was the intention of these workshops to increase the effectiveness of selected distributive education personnel in designing projects, project plans, and related participating experiences. It was believed that this increase in effectiveness could best be obtained through pursuit of the objectives that follow.

1. To prepare selected distributive education teachers and coordinators in the use and preparation of project education materials.

2. To identify and develop the structure of projects to be used by teachers in relation to career objectives, units of study, and individual needs.

3. Develop guidelines to implement the necessary relationships with the business community.

4. To examine patterns of evaluation and measurement during and following project training.

5. To gain appreciation of purposes of projects in terms of their application to realistic employment situations.

6. To identify resources available and their contributions to effective project training.

Procedure

The responsibility for developin_ the consortium of cooperating institutions, preliminary planning of the workshop program, provision of general guidelines, and consultation to workshop staff plus management of all disbursements, evaluations, and report preparation was assumed by the University of Wisconsin.

An original consortium of four institutions (Rutgers, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Idaho, and the University of Wisconsin) each to conduct a workshop for 30 participants (120 teachers in total) was rendered impossible because of limited funds. The funding provided permitted two workshops each supporting up to 30 participants each. U.S.O.E. recommendations placed one workshop at Rutgers and the other was conducted at the University of Wisconsin.

Communications were directed to each state supervisor of distributive education providing information about the workshops and application forms for interested and recommended personnel (see Appendix A). The criteria for invitation to attend one of the workshops were as follows:

1. The individual will have experience as a teacher or coordinator of distributive education.

2. The individual will possess an educational background showing course work in marketing, distribution, educational psychology, learning theory, and professional distributive education.

3. The individual shall have potential for extending leadership to other distributive personnel and the capacity to disseminate information about project curricula material.

4. The individual should be recommended by his state supervisor of distributive education. If state policy prevents such a recommendation, the selection of a participant shall be based on the other criteria of this list.

5. The individual will devote full-time during the period of the workshop to workshop activities, studies, and related work.

6. The individual shall agree to pursue a program of professional reading and to conduct a program analysis prior to the workshop.

The workshop advisory committee (workshop directors, project director, and distributive education staff, Division of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S.O.E.) made the final decision on participants. The selection of 30 participants for each workshop was made from 93 applications from 40 states. Because of last minute cancellations by invited participants actual participants at Rutgers were 25 and 27 at the University of Wisconsin.

The workshop held at Rutgers was from June 19 to June 30, 1967. The workshop held at the University of Wisconsin was from July 30 to August 11, 1967. Each workshop provided the following program of instruction and activity:

Presentations on Distributive Education, Curriculum, and Instructional Procedures - 16 hours
Presentations on Business, Marketing, and Research - 8 hours
Small Group Discussions and Work Sessions - 18 hours
Workshop Readings, Individual Preparation and Planning - 19 hours
Reports, Critiques, and Discussion of Projects and Papers - 11 hours

On the last day of the workshop each participant was asked to give their reaction (Appendix B and Appendix C) to the workshop activities. Also, by the last day of the workshop each participant had developed a plan for disseminating the workshop materials and information to the D. E. teachers in his state.

In mid-October, 1967 a questionnaire was sent to each participant and to their respective State Supervisor of Distributive Education to determine what success had been achieved in dissemination of projects and project plan information. (Appendix D and Appendix E). No follow up on these questionnaires was made. These findings were reviewed by a committee of Distributive Educators and are reported in Section II and Section III of this report.

SECTION II

Findings and Results

Complete information on each of the project development workshops including day by day programs, papers and presentations, projects that were developed, names of participants and workshop staff, may be found in the reports prepared on each workshop titled as follows:

Workshop Report - Distributive Education Project Development Workshop Rutgers - The State University

Workshop Report - Distributive Education Project Development Workshop The University of Wisconsin

Copies of the above reports were provided each workshop participant, each State Supervisor of Distributive Education, and Head Distributive Education Teacher Educator.

It should be noted that papers presented at the National Seminar on Distributive Teacher Education [1] and used in the workshops are not contained in the Workshop Reports. Only papers presented originally at the workshops are included. The major part of each Workshop Report is the projects developed by the participants for use with high school level distributive education students. The workshop at Rutgers produced 10 projects designed for class or small group effort and 25 projects for use by individual students. The workshop at the University of Wisconsin produced 12 class or small group projects and 27 projects designed for use by individual students.

---

[1] The following publications resulted from the 1967 National Seminar on Distributive Teacher Education Conducted by Michigan State University and contain papers used in the Distributive Education Project Development Workshops.

Readings in Distributive Education: The Project Method

Guidelines for Implementing The Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education Through Teacher Education

Guidelines for Implementing The Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education in The Schools

The above are available from:

Educational Publications
202 Erickson Hall - College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Reaction to Workshop

Each participant was asked to complete an evaluation form on the workshop he or she attended. The purpose of this evaluation was to obtain participants reaction to the value of each presentation in helping them understand project training and value of each presentation in helping them implement project training. Several open ended questions were also asked to ascertain any concerns or questions that might remain after the workshop experience.

A summary of participants reactions for the Rutgers workshop may be found in Appendix B. The summary of participants reactions for the University of Wisconsin workshop is in Appendix C.

Presentations dealing with projects, project development, and implementing project programs received the highest ratings. Presentations dealing with business topics received lower ratings. Questions most frequently remaining after the workshop were about curriculum design, how to get the project type plan into operation, and the relationship of project plans with the traditional cooperative plans.

Follow-up of Dissemination Efforts

During the workshop each participant prepared a plan to follow in the dissemination of workshop materials and information to fellow distributive teacher coordinators in their home state. These plans were reviewed by the workshop staff, presented and discussed by all workshop members, and were to serve as a guide for each participants service to his or her state during the 1967-68 school year. Considerable effort was made to motivate individuals to get the results of the workshop spread among the teachers in the state they represented.

In mid-October, 1967 a letter and a questionnaire was sent to each participant and to their respective State Supervisor of Distributive Education. The purpose of this evaluation was two-fold. First, to determine how successful the participant had been in carrying out his plan for dissemination, and, secondly, getting from the state supervisor confirming and supplementary information on project development material dissemination in that state. Questionnaires were returned by 45 of the 52 participants (87%) and by 28 supervisors from the 37 states that had participants in attendance at a workshop (76%).

A summary of the responses on questionnaires returned by supervisors may be found in Appendix D. A summary of responses on questionnaires returned by participants may be found in Appendix E.

Ways in Which Information Was Shared

The information on the project method presented and developed at the workshops was shared by the participants in a variety of methods and in various degrees of formality. Perhaps the most common media of commun-

ication was the oral presentation at group meetings on state, regional, and local levels. The size of the groups (numbers of people involved) varied considerably depending on the nature of the meeting or gathering. Some participants reported sharing workshop information at formally conducted meetings, such as workshops or in-service training sessions, while others reported less formalized efforts suggesting "unstructured" conversation with their colleagues.

The mid-October follow-up allowed only about 8 weeks after the last workshop. However, by that date 63% of all participants had made at least one major presentation to the D.E. teachers in their state reaching, according to state supervisors, about 1560 distributive teachers. Many participants indicated that initial or additional dissemination via personal presentations would come during the spring of 1968. Informal reports from participants indicate accomplishment of these dissemination activities.

In addition to oral presentations considerable project material was duplicated and distributed at various meetings or mailed to D.E. teachers. In the majority of the states participants met with their state supervisor to discuss the project materials and review dissemination plans.

Success of The Dissemination Effort

The success of the dissemination effort seems to depend, as judged from the individual questionnaires, on these factors:

1. The general attitude of the participant toward his profession (D.E.) in general and the project method in particular.

2. The climate in the D.E. State Supervisors office relative to the project method and the degree of cooperation given the participant in dissemination of workshop information.

3. The opportunities available to the participant for sharing the workshop material. (Some states, because of organization or structure of D.E. at the state level, provide many more sessions, meetings, or conferences for their teachers.)

4. Time available to participant for dissemination. (In many states coordinator meetings for late summer and fall had been already been set with little or no time for participant to report. Programs of meetings in spring and early summer of 1968 showed considerable more time being given to project plan material and discussion.

The follow-up was not designed to produce quantitative measures of dissemination success, however, it is felt that the dissemination effort for this workshop was significantly better than that achieved by many national workshops in education. It was particularly satisfying to note the speed with which many participants extended information and that state supervisors as well as teacher coordinators were informed.

SECTION III

Recommendations

The conduct of the Regional Distributive Education Project Development Workshops was, in a sense, a third phase of an overall effort to bring attention and understanding to the modifications in vocational application made possible in distributive education by the Vocational Act of 1963. The first phase was the National Distributive Education Conference held in Chicago, Illinois, January, 1967. At that conference the state supervisors of D.E. were informed of plans for developing materials on project training through a seminar for teacher educators and workshops for selected teachers. During May, 1967, under the sponsorship of Michigan State University, two national D. E. Teacher Education Seminars were held to develop fundamental concepts and philosophy on project training for distributive education. (Reports of the seminar are listed on page 6) The project development workshops were to expedite and improve the project approach to distributive education by providing a selected group of D. E. teacher coordinators project plan background and opportunity to develop actual projects for use in distributive education classes.

On the basis of the workshop evaluations, actual projects produced, and the subsequent dissemination of materials and information it is felt that the six primary objectives of the workshops were met. The dissemeffort, although ineffective in some ways in some states, did much to extend the value of the workshops beyond just the immediate participants.

The recommendations that follow deal with several different concerns. Some of the recommendations (all made by the review committee and based upon workshop evaluations and questionnaire responses from state supervisors and participants) are clearly on the workshop phase, others on the dissemination phase, and others are a combination of these two or on additional concerns. The recommendations appear in no order of priority or sense of classification.

1. State supervisor's committment to dissemination should be more clearly established prior to acceptance of recommended participant.

2. Selection of participants should be more carefully done to insure a receptive, cooperative, objective audience at the workshop. Eliminate those with only a casual interest.

3. Impress more strongly on the participants their responsibility to share workshop experience with their collegues in their respective states before the conduct of the workshop.

4. Pre-workshop materials mailed out well in advance of workshop to selected participants and to state supervisor.

5. Workshop participants should be provided immediately with one copy of all papers, reports, and projects for use by state leadership personnel.

6. Communication media for dissemination should be developed in workshop.

7. Workshop participants should be instructed on common and newer duplicating and reproduction techniques prior to leaving conference.

8. Sufficient funds should be allocated to allow for the reproduction of an adequate number of the final workshop reports.

9. A model presentation (dissemination) should be developed by participants for selected audiences and for various time periods allocated for such presentations.

10. Participants should be provided adequate time to verbalize their actual presentation of the major concepts of project training to potential audiences.

11. Guidelines for dissemination should be provided participants and copies mailed to individuals who might be involved.

12. Group follow-up sessions of workshop participants should be held at selected locations to study and analyze problems which participants experienced in implementation of workshop materials.

13. Follow-up studies should be made at various intervals to determine the most effective method of achieving a behavior change through workshops.

14. Within each state area curriculum workshops should be conducted with the workshop participant and state supervisor serving as co-leaders of the activity.

15. Develop for national distribution a manual which will simplify the steps a teacher will use in developing projects.

16. Coordinators should be continously provided information about projects and project training rather than given a large amount at a single time.

17. Attention should be given other audiences such as business people, guidance personnel, administrators, and teachers of related subjects.

18. Mailings from participants to other coordinators should be directed through state supervisors in order that controversial philosophies in a state may be avoided.

19. Publicity announcing national or regional workshops should be made through all possible media and not just through state supervisors or state directors.

APPENDIX A

ANNOUNCING

NATIONAL WORKSHOPS IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

PURPOSE

The participants will have the opportunity to work with an outstanding staff of national leaders in distributive education in identifying, planning, developing, and implementing projects and materials in distributive education. The individuals selected for these workshops will have an opportunity to study in depth the nature and scope of project education and to develop materials to be shared by all distributive personnel.

WORKSHOP CONTENT

Each workshop will be of two weeks duration requiring the full time participation of each person attending. The focus will be on the project method of instruction, the nature, methodology, criteria for projects, project development, innovative practices in project useage and project program development.

DATES AND LOCATION

Participants will attend -

Rutgers - The State University
June 19 to June 30, 1967
Workshop Director: Ralph A. Rush

The University of Wisconsin
July 30 to August 11, 1967
Workshop Director: Harland E. Samson

HOW TO APPLY

The project with the U. S. Office of Education allows 30 participants at each workshop. Individuals should request application forms from the State Supervisor of Distributive Education or from Distributive Education Workshop, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. A selection committee will review applications and selected participants to be notified by May 5, 1967.

These workshops are being carried out by the University of Wisconsin in Consortium with Rutgers - The State University pursuant to a contract with the Division of Adult Vocational Research, Bureau of Research, United States Office of Education

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The criteria for selection as a workshop participant includes the following:

1. Experience in distributive education as a teacher and coordinator.
2. Recommendation of state supervisor or other appropriate administrator relative to potential for extending leadership.
3. The capacity and opportunity to disseminate project materials upon return to home state.
4. Ability to devote full time to the workshop over its entirety.
5. Willingness to undertake prior preparation for readings and analysis.
6. Demonstrated writing ability.
7. Preparation in learning theory and marketing.

THE AWARD

Selected participants will be provided full reimbursement for travel, workshop materials, and two weeks subsistance at rate of $75 per week.

ASSIGNMENT OF WORKSHOPS*

Individuals selected from the following states will attend the workshop at Rutgers - The State University, June 19 to June 30, 1967:

Michigan, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticutt.

Individuals selected from the following states will attend the workshop at The University of Wisconsin, July 30 to August 11, 1967:

Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Alaska, Hawaii, California, Oregon, Utah, Washington.

*Upon formal request from State Supervisor, individuals may be placed in alternate workshop provided space is available. No additional allowance will be made for transportation.

APPLICATION FOR NATIONAL WORKSHOP IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION - PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Return completed application to:
Dr. Harland E. Samson, Director
Distributive Education Workshops
School of Education
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(Application Deadline April 28, 1967)

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. **Full Name** Dr. / Mr. / Mrs. / Miss _____
   Last Name **First Name** **Middle**

2. **Home Address** _____
   Number **Street**

   _____
   City **State** **Zip** **Phone**

3. **Current Professional Position:**

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. **Position Responsibilities:**

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. **Institution Address:** _____
   Name **Street**

   _____
   City **State** **Zip** **Phone**

6. **What responsibilities will you have next school year?**

   _____

   _____

II. EDUCATION

1. **List in chronological order all degrees earned, beginning with bachelors, and show number of hours earned beyond last degree.**

Institution	Degree - Year	Hours - Year
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

II. Education Cont'd.

2. Thesis Subject _____

3. List all courses completed in professional distributive education:*

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

4. List all courses completed in marketing and distribution:*

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

*(Copy of transcript may be submitted in place of listing items #3 and #4.)

III. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Starting with the position you will hold for school year 1967-1968, show all prior teaching experience.

Institution	Location	Title of position-subjects taught-other duties	Dates

IV. OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE

List all occupational experience in marketing or distribution with most recent experience given first.

Employer	Location	Position and Duties	Part-time or Full-time	Dates

Name _____ State _____
Last First Middle

IX. WORKSHOP DISSEMINATION

Describe how you intend to share the learnings, information and other material gained from the workshop with other distributive education personnel in your state.

V. PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

List all professional meetings and workshops you have attended in the past three years.

Name of Meeting	Where Held	Date and Length

VI. PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

List current professional memberships.

VII. PROFESSIONAL WRITINGS

List published articles and other writings produced during the last five years.

VIII. SPECIAL AREA OF INTEREST

Check your special area of interest (or add to list) both for functions of distribution and by occupational area.

Function	Occupational Area	
Management	Food	Home Furnishings
Selling	Petroleum	Wholesaling
Buying	Clothing	Retail Services
Promotion	Housewares	
Personnel	Hardware	
Finance	Appliances	

IX. WORKSHOP DISSEMINATION

Describe fully on the blue insert sheet how you intend to share the learnings, information, and other material gained from the project development workshop with other distributive education personnel in your state.

X. LOCAL PROJECT PLANS

What are your plans for developing and implementing project training in your school district (system) next year?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

XI. ENDORSEMENT OF STATE SUPERVISOR AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATOR

I recommend the attendance of this applicant to the national workshop on distributive education project development because _____

_____

Local Supervisor _____ Phone _____

I recommend the attendance of this applicant to the national workshop on distributive education project development because _____

_____

Local Administrator _____ Phone _____

XII. STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

If selected as a participant at this national workshop, I will be willing to devote adequate time prior to the workshop to study materials provided me, to devote my entire time during the two-week workshop to instruction and study, and to complete necessary follow-up on workshop outcomes.

_____ _____

Date Signature of Applicant

Those selected as participants will receive round-trip transportation from there home community to the workshop designated for their state and a stipend of $75.00 per week for expenses during the two-week workshop.

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL WORKSHOPS IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Summary of
Participant Reactions and Suggestions
Rutgers Workshop

For each workshop topic check your reaction in each of the two columns at the right.

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
The Project Method in Education Beverly Savidge	4	11	8	2	-	2	9	11	3	-
Attaining Learning Outcomes Vivian Ely	20	5	-	-	-	18	6	1	-	-
Setting Objectives for Projects Marvin Hershfield	16	6	3	-	-	15	6	4	-	-
Business Views: "The Consumer" Mrs. Edward Boehm	2	-	9	8	6	1	-	5	7	12
Types of Projects Ralph Rush	3	2	11	6	1	2	3	11	6	1
Anatomy of Projects Ralph Rush	3	14	3	-	-	4	15	6	-	-

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Business Views: "Marketing and Consumer Research" - Sid Stein	9	5	8	1	1	10	3	10	1	-
Case Studies in Analyzing Projects Charles Drawbough	10	11	5	1	-	8	12	6	-	-
"Youth with Special Needs" - Dr. Robt. Worthington	-	3	9	10	2	-	3	6	7	3
Business Views: "Credit and Collections" Edward J. Brennan	1	4	7	9	4	1	4	6	10	4
Developing the Project Matrix Harland E. Samson	16	2	3	2	1	13	4	3	2	2
Controlling Project Experience Clifford Freund	2	11	10	2	-	1	15	6	2	1
Business Views: "Merchandising" William Price	5	7	9	3	1	5	5	9	5	1
Using Appropriate Facilities and Equipment Garland Wiggs	5	10	8	2	-	7	9	7	2	-
The Project Teaching in Action Vivian Ely	22	3	-	-	-	20	4	1	-	-

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Concerns in Managing Project Plan Ralph Rush	8	13	4	-	-	8	15	1	1	-
Evaluation of Projects and Project Outcomes Marvin Hershfield	8	10	5	1	-	7	9	5	2	1
Business Views: "Personnel Employment" Lawrence Elkins	9	10	-	4	1	4	6	6	6	1
Multiple Level Projects Ralph Rush	9	10	5	1	-	9	9	6	1	-
Variations in Time and Place Patterns Paul Hartman	4	16	5	-	1	4	13	6	2	-
Advantages and Disadvantages of Patterns Donald Snodgrass	4	13	6	-	1	4	12	6	2	-
Business Views: "Personnel Analysis" J. M. Vanderford	1	7	7	5	4	1	3	8	10	2
Working with Business and Industry Ralph Rush	5	16	3	1	-	5	14	5	1	-

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Business Views: "Advertising and Sales Promotion" Robert Cuthbert	13	5	4	1	2	11	4	6	4	1
Extending Project Information to Distributive Personnel (Communications) John Moulette	1	5	9	9	1	2	1	10	11	1
Business Views: "Materials Handling" Sperry & Hutchinson	4	4	10	5	2	3	3	11	5	3
Moving Ahead with Project Training Ralph Rush	11	8	6	-	-	11	10	4	-	-
Youth with Special Needs Dr. Bruce Tuckman	1	8	8	5	2	1	5	7	9	2

APPENDIX C

NATIONAL WORKSHOPS IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Summary of
Participant Reactions and Suggestions
University of Wisconsin Workshop

For each workshop topic check your reaction in each of the two columns at the right.

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Distributive Education Today Dr. Samson	17	5	4	-	1	11	6	8	1	-
Similarities and Differences of Project and Cooperative Plans Mary V. Marks	11	13	3	-	-	7	9	9	2	-
Setting Learning Objectives Mr. Meyer	5	11	8	3	-	8	7	9	2	1
Competencies Included in Distributive Education Mr. Nichols	9	11	6	1	-	9	11	5	1	1
Business Views: The Consumer Mr. H. R. Briggs	4	5	8	9	1	2	4	10	10	1

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	SSome	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Types of Projects - Matrix Dr. Samson	24	3	-	-	-	22	4	1	-	-
The Structure of a Project Dr. Samson	27	-	-	-	-	25	1	1	-	-
Case Studies in Analyzing Projects Dr. Ertel	9	13	5	-	-	8	12	6	1	-
Non-Computer--Two Product Business Game Staff	4	4	10	6	3	3	8	5	6	5
Business Views: Who Speaks for the Consumer Karl Bing	5	5	8	8	1	3	3	13	6	3
"Youth with Special Needs" Mr. Gordon Berry	9	7	8	2	1	6	6	11	3	1
Evaluation of Projects and Outcomes Dr. Ashmun	15	9	3	-	-	14	9	3	1	-
Developing Guidelines for Evaluation Dr. Ashmun	13	12	2	-	-	12	12	3	-	-
Business Views: "Store Operations" Stuart Hagen	2	4	14	7	-	-	9	11	6	1
Project Teaching in Action Staff Panel	8	6	11	2	-	6	7	14	-	-

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Working with Business and Industry Mr. Rush	4	9	10	4	-	6	8	12	1	-
Project Variations and Patterns Participant Panel	5	8	11	3	-	5	9	9	3	1
PERT - Managing the Project Plans Duane Flagg	1	3	15	5	3	2	8	13	3	1
Business Views: " Personnel Policies" James M. Guinan	3	7	7	9	1	4	6	14	2	1
Audio-Visual Demonstration Unit Staff	2	4	10	4	6	4	3	11	6	3
Extending Project Information to Distributive Personnel Dr. Tiger	4	9	10	3	1	10	10	5	2	-
Business Views: "Quick Service Food Store-Planning and Development" Jeffery Foulks	1	5	8	13	-	2	6	10	9	1
"The Impact of Technology Toward Improved Teaching" Dr. Robert Gates	-	2	6	10	9	-	2	6	11	8

Topic	Value to Understanding Project Training					Value to Implementing Project Laboratory				
	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None	Very	Quite	Some	Little	None
Business Views: "The Industrial Distributor" Robert H. Taylor	-	2	12	11	1	-	4	8	11	3
Business Views: "Direct Sales" H. A. Schatz	4	5	9	8	-	6	7	9	4	-
Moving Ahead with Project Training Dr. Samson	15	10	2	-	-	17	10	-	-	-
Project Critiques Participants	13	7	6	1	-	14	9	3	1	-

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL WORKSHOPS IN PROJECT

DEVELOPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Summary of Responses on Supervisor Questionnaire (N=37)

What has the participant done to keep you informed about his participation in the National Workshop?

1.	participant met with supervisor to plan dissemination and to report on workshop	16	Wis., Ill. (a,b), Michigan (a,b), Oregon (a,b), Arizona, Minnesota, Kentucky, Pennsylvania (a), Maryland, South Carolina (a,b), Alabana, North Carolina (a)
2.	participant gave an oral presentation at a conference of coordinators	8	Iowa, Indiana, District of Columbia, Montana, West Virginia, Georgia, Virginia (a,b)
3.	participant wrote a report on National Workshop and gave it to supervisor	5	Oklahoma, New Mexico, North Carolina (b), Tennessee, New York
4.	no answer given	3	Utah, Florida (a and b)
5.	participant telephone supervisor	3	Texas (a,b), Pennsylvania (b)
6.	participant wrote a letter to supervisor	3	New Jersey (a,b), Pennsylvania (c)
7.	oral report	2	Nebraska (a,b)
8.	little	1	Louisiana

Did the participant meet with you to discuss the dissemination of workshop materials?

1.	yes	35	Wisconsin, Illinois (a,b), Iowa, Minnesota, Utah, Nebraska (a,b), Indiana, Oregon, (a,b) Montana, Arizona, District of Columbia, Okla., N. Mexico, Louisiana, Mich., (a,b) West Virginia, Fla.(a,b), Ala., N. Carolina (a), Kentucky, N. Jersey (a), Maryland, Tenn., Virginia (a,b), S. Carolina (a,b), New York, Pennsylvania (a,b)
2.	no	5	Texas (a,b), North Carolina (b), New Jersey (b), Missouri
3.	no answer	1	Georgia

How many of the Distributive Teacher-Coordinators in your state have received information from the participant?

1.	all teacher-coordinators in the state	14	Kentucky, Ala., Wisconsin, S. Carolina (a,b), Ill. (a,b), Mich. (a,b), Minn., Ind., Okla., District of Columbia, N. Mexico
2.	no number specified	12	Iowa, Utah, Nebraska (a,b), Oregon (a,b), Louisiana, Georgia, N. Jersey (a,b) Missouri, Pennsylvania (a)
3.	75	2	Florida (a,b)
4.	40	2	North Carolina (a,b)
5.	250	2	Virginia (a,b)
6.	85	2	Texas (a,b)
7.	12	1	West Virginia
8.	42	1	Maryland
9.	33	1	Tennessee
10.	350	1	New York
11.	10	1	Pennsylvania (b)
12.	50	1	Pennsylvania (c)
13.	5	1	Montana
14.	30	1	Arizona

In what manner did the Distributive Teacher-Coordinators receive this information?

1.	at various state meetings - for ex. IBEA conferences, DECA conferences, and in-service workshops; vocational conf.	15	North Carolina (a,b) Maryland, Tenn., Kentucky, Ill. (a,b), Montana, Arizona, Texas (a,b), Nebraska (a,b), District of Columbia, Okla.
2.	summer workshops and summer DE conferences	7	Wisconsin, Texas, Alabama, Virginia (a,b), South Carolina (a,b)
3.	oral presentation and written material	6	Florida (a,b), New Jersey (a), Minn., Ind., N. Mexico
4.	no answer given	6	Utah, Oregon, Louisiana, Georgia, Missouri, Pennsylvania (b)
5.	by newsletter	4	Wisconsin, Kentucky, New York, Michigan
6.	written summaries of information on project method prepared and distributed to coordinators	3	West Virginia, Kentucky, New Jersey
7.	oral presentation only	2	Iowa, Pennsylvania (a)
8.	seminars held with coordinators	1	Pennsylvania (c)

What information did the Distributive Teacher-Coordinators receive?

1.	no answer given	15	Florida (a,b), Georgia, Iowa, N. Jersey (a), Maryland, Utah, Missouri, Pennsylvania (a), Texas (a,b), Oregon, Nebraska, (a,b), Montana
2.	general information on project method, what it is, suggestions for it, how to develop projects, etc.	14	Wisconsin, Minn., Ind., Okla., Mich. (a,b), Arizona, W. Virginia, N. Carolina (a,b), S. Carolina (a,b), New York, Pennsylvania (b)
3.	copies of workshop projects	5	Kentucky, N. Mexico, Minn., Ind., District of Columbia,
4.	information participants received at national workshop	2	Alabama, Tennessee
5.	copies of "Concepts Concerning Program Instruction - Believe Them or Not"	2	Virginia (a,b)
6.	Mary Marks' paper on project method and Dr. Samson's on matrix	2	Illinois (a,b)
7.	none	1	Louisiana
8.	a manual (?)	1	New Jersey (b)
9.	how project method was put into action at participants' vocational school	1	Pennsylvania (c)

What difficulties has the participant experienced in disseminating materials to the Coordinators in his state?

1.	none	14	W. Virginia, Maryland, Utah, Virginia (a,b), Illinois (a,b), Minn., Ind., Mont., District of Columbia, New Mexico, Okla., Louisiana
2.	no answer given	8	Iowa, Texas (a,b), Florida,(a,b), Georgia, New Jersey (a,b)
3.	getting entire state together for meeting	3	Tennessee, Nebraska (a,b)
4.	direct dissemination of information to coordinators	3	New York, Pennsylvania (a), Arizona
5.	difficulties in organizing regional conferences	3	Wisconsin, Michigan (a,b)
6.	teachers are not receptive because they feel project method is being forced upon them or feel it is too difficult and too much work	3	Kentucky, S. Carolina (a,b)
7.	difficulties with the participants themselves (either in position or in cooperation)	2	Missouri, Oregon
8.	inaccessibility of participant to workshops	1	Pennsylvania (b)
9.	lack of understanding of project plan by coordinators	1	Alabama

What plans have been made regarding the dissemination of the materials between now and the end of the 1967-68 school year?

1.	distribution of all project materials made available	16	Wis., Ill. (a,b), Arizona, N. Mexico, W. Virginia, Okla., Pennsylvania (b), N. Carolina (a,b), Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, S. Carolina (a,b), Alabama
2.	plans for regional or state workshops, or in-service meetings in the future for presentation and dissemination of project information	16	Wis., Iowa, Minn., New York, Mich., Utah, Nebraska (a,b), Oregon (a,b), Arizona, District of Columbia, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey (a,b)
3.	no plans specified	5	Virginia (a,b), Pennsylvania (a), Montana, Louisiana
4.	no answer given	3	Florida (a,b), Missouri
5.	summer courses suggested	1	Kentucky
6.	a pilot project in project method made at participant's school and report made	1	Pennsylvania
7.	plans for materials center to refine projects for guiding coordinators	1	Indiana

What could be done to assist you in the distribution of project information in your state?

1.	nothing specified	7	Ill. (a,b), Mich.(a,b), Iowa, Minn., Nebraska
2.	no answer given	6	Florida (a,b), Georgia, Mont., Missouri, W. Virginia
3.	request for sending information on projects directly to state supervisor (before coordinators)	6	Kentucky, Tenn., Virginia (a,b), Utah, Arizona
4.	copy for each program	3	New Jersey (a,b), Okla.
5.	a manual (brochure or bulletin) on developing project method	3	North Carolina (a,b), New York
6.	regional workshop for special training	2	Texas (a,b)
7.	Modus Operandi	2	Oregon (a,b)
8.	funds	2	Pennsylvania (a,b)
9.	request for Wisconsin projects	1	Maryland
10.	need for <u>projects as revised</u> for dissemination	1	Wisconsin
11.	serve as consultant for curriculum workshops	1	Alabama
12.	request for more development of standardized projects at local level	1	Indiana
13.	final reports and evaluation of national workshops	1	District of Columbia
14.	write follow-up letter to participants	1	Louisiana
15.	conference of state supervisors	1	Utah
16.	a meeting of all DE personnel in seminar fashion	1	Pennsylvania (c)

APPENDIX E

NATIONAL WORKSHOPS IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Summary of Responses on Participant Questionnaires (N=52)

How many meetings have you had with your state supervisor or other state staff to inform him of your activities in connection with the Project Development Workshop and the materials that have been developed?

1.	two meetings	16	Ala., 2 Mich., N. Dakota, Nebr., N. Mexico, 2 Texas, Ill., Mass., Maryland, 2 Virginia, Miss.
2.	one meeting	11	New Jersey, Mont., N. Carolina, Iowa, 2 Pa., W. Virginia, Wis., Va., Nebr., Illinois
3.	three meetings	5	Fla., Pa., Puerto Rico, Ore., Wyo.
4.	no meetings	2	North Carolina, Missouri
5.	discussions	2	Louisiana, Tennessee
6.	no formal meetings	2	Washington, Arizona
7.	four meetings	1	South Carolina
8.	five meetings	1	Kentucky
9.	ten meetings	1	South Carolina
10.	no answer	1	New York
11.	other answers included: one phone call; several informal; and several telephone conversations	6	New Jersey, Okla., Mich., Wis., Va., Nebraska

How many presentations have you made to distributive teacher coordinators in your state regarding project training and project materials?

1.	one	22	Mont., N. Carolina, Okla., 2 Pa., Ala., 2 S. Carolina, Oregon, Ky., Puerto Rico, Tenn., Iowa, Wis., W. Virginia, Va., Nebr., Mich., Texas, Ill., Ind., Missour
2.	two	11	Wash., N. Mexico, Texas, Ill., Nebr., Fla., Maryland, 2 Virginia, Minn., Wyoming
3.	none	4	New York, Mass., Pa., Arizona
4.	no answer	2	Mich., Louisiana
5.	one formal plus informal	2	N. Dakota, Mississippi
6.	three	1	New Jersey

What type of information seemed to be of most interest to those that you have talked with?

1.	mechanics of project method	12	N. Carolina, Mont., Ala., Ore., Puerto Rico, N. Mexico, Iowa, Ky., Pa., N. Carolina, Nebr. Ill.
2.	actual projects	10	2 Pa., Okla., S. Carolina, N. Dakota, N. Mexico, Va., Texas, Wyo.
3.	how to construct projects	8	Okla., Mont., Texas, Nebr., Mich., Maryland, Minn., Texas
4.	availability of projects	6	N. Carolina, Wash., Ky., Va., Ind., Missouri
5.	no answer	4	New York, Mich., La., Mass.
6.	teaching method	2	Fla., New Jersey
7.	how does project method compare with coop method	2	S. Carolina, Nebr.
8.	project outline	2	Tenn., Ill.
9.	results	1	Wisconsin
10.	clarification of term "Project Method"	1	Virginia
11.	other answers listed by only 1 participant: how and where coop. teachers fit into project plan?; in classroom; types of projects; how to promote project method; undetermined; comparison of information given at National and state Workshop; reaction of other coordinators to project method; equipment needed; teacher qualifications; project method-solution for unemployable students	10	Ala., Wash., Ill., Pa., W. Va., Ariz., N. Carolina, 2 Miss., S. Carolina

What difficulties have you experienced in distributing project materials to the distributive personnel in your state?

1.	no difficulties	18	Fla., N. Jersey, 2 Pa., Ala., S. Carolina, Ore., Ill., Ky., Va., W. Va., Maryland, Miss., Wis., S. Carolina, Va., Nebr. Texas
2.	not enough time	4	Okla., Penn., Ariz., Mo.
3.	reproducing, compiling, and mailing	4	Mont., Ariz., Ill., Wyo.
4.	no answer	2	Mich., La.
5.	hesitancy of state supervisor to accept new idea	2	North Dakota, Iowa.
6.	hesitancy	1	Mich.
7.	lack of understanding	1	Minnesota
8.	communications	1	Indiana
9.	other answers cited only once were: awaiting administrative decision; awaiting complete set of projects; large number needed; no editorial help to have booklet reproduced; misunderstanding as to responsibility; small staff-takes time; don't know where to send them; setting up dates to present materials; lack of interest by state officials; lack of coordination among participants from state; haven't been distributed yet; state has different concept of project method	15	New York, 2 N. Carolina, Pureto Rico, Tenn., Wash., N. Mexico, Texas, Nebr., Mass., Pa., Va., Mich., Minn., Ind.

What are your plans regarding distribution of information and materials between now and the end of the 1967-68 school year?

1.	regional meetings	7	Ind., Texas, Minn., Wis., Pa., Ore., N. Jersey
2.	makes copies of projects available to all state-wide	6	N. Dakota, Maryland, Okla., Mont., N. Carolina, Pa.
3.	make copies of projects available to coordinators with project plans	6	Ind., Iowa, Nebr., Ala., Wash., (a) Mo.
4.	speaking to district vocational teachers	4	Nebr., N. Carolina, Florida, Mich.
5.	plans awaiting state staff action	4	Tenn., La., S. Carolina, Mich.
6.	teachers' convention	4	Mich., Ill., N. Mexico, N. Jersey
7.	expect institutional workshops during year summer 1968 workshop	3	Ore., Ore., Ill.
8.	director's office	2	Mass., New Jersey
9.	local use also	2	Wash. (a), N. Mexico
10.	use of information in Newsletter	2	Kentucky, Wis.
11.	in-service meeting	2	Pa., Va.
12.	other included: three-day workshop; local use only; meetings scheduled by state supervisor; undetermined; presentation at state Delegate Assembly-make copies available to; conferences; state workshops; business education association fall conference; 3 projects per week	9	Okla., Puerto Rico, Texas, W. Va. Ariz., Miss., Va., Ill., Wyo.

What could be done to assist you in the distribution of project information in your state?

1.	no assistance needed or uncertain	13	Nebr., Mich., Texas, Missouri, Okla., Ala., S. Carolina, Ore., Tenn., N. Carolina, Miss., Wis., Wyo.
2.	forward new and current information on project method	4	Ala., Puerto Rico, Texas, Kentucky
3.	state office reproduce and distribute materials	2	North Carolina, Arizona
4.	get to State Director and DE State Supervisor	2	Mass., Virginia
5.	other answers: evaluation of present program; orientation program on project method; exchange of information on how other state depts. approach problem; grants of money for paper, postage, etc.; reproduce materials for them; make workshop instructional aids available to participants; provide state supervisor with information on how project training can be used in accordance with legislation; information in compact form; provide state office with all workshop materials; federal funds to augment state staff to handle projects; get materials and information to other area conferences; dates agreeable to all; more interest on part of state supervisor; make part of teacher-training programs; wide dissemination to college personnel on info about project method; get state to include in state plan; copies of U. W. workshop projects; more written materials; have teacher-educators distribute it; state develop a resource center; states exchange projects; memo from state to all coordinator areas about method	24	Fla., New Jersey, New York, 3 Pa., Mont., Mich., N. Dakota, Louisiana, Wash., N. Mexico, 2 Ill., Nebr., Iowa, W. Va., Maryland, S. Carolina, 2 Va., Minn., Ind.

Do you believe a regional or national workshop should be conducted for additional work on project development in distributive education? If so, describe its length, time of year, and nature of workshop content.

1.	yes	16	Tex., Mich., 2 Va., Miss., Maryland, Pa., W. Va., Kentucky, Wash. N. J., Mont., Puerto Rico, Tenn., Wyo.
2.	question not answered	6	Mo., Nebr., S. Carolina, Fla., New York., Mass.
3.	no	3	N. Carolina, Iowa, Pa.
4.	length 1 week	17	Ill., Mich., Wis., Md., Nebr., Ill. N. Mex., N. Carolina, Okla., Pa., Mont., Ala., Ore., Tenn., Wash., N. Mexico
	2 weeks	6	Va., Pa., S. Carolina, N. Dak., La., Kan.
	3 weeks	4	Wyo., Miss., N. Jersey, Texas
	3 days	1	W. Va.
5.	time of year - July	1	Nebr.
	Summer	6	Ill., Miss., Ill., N. Carolina, N. Dakota, Puerto Rico
	June	10	Wyo., Wis., Va., Kan., Texas, Okla., Pa., Mont., Puerto Rico, Tenn.
	August	3	Kan., Okla., Wash.
	January	1	W. Va.
6.	nature of content emphasis on types of projects;	1	N. Jersey
	integration into local curriculum;	1	Mich.
	application to state plans;	1	Mich.
	instructional techniques;	1	New Jersey
	project method in function	2	Puerto Rico, Va.
	development of project study;	20	Nebr., N. J., N. C., Pa., Mont., S. C., N. D., Mo., Ill., Tex., Mich., Wis., Ariz., Pa., Kan., La., Ore., Tenn., Wash., Ill.
	facilities and equipment	1	La.
	same content as this summer projects which could be used in coop programs	2	N. Mex., Ariz.
		1	Texas
	state staff should meet	1	Va.
7.	regional	8	Ind., Minn., Wis., Ariz., N. C., Okla., Pa., Texas
8.	national workshops	2	North Dak., New Mexico